

1 GLYNN & FINLEY, LLP
CLEMENT L. GLYNN, Bar No. 57117
2 ADAM FRIEDENBERG, Bar No. 205778
One Walnut Creek Center
3 100 Pringle Avenue, Suite 500
Walnut Creek, CA 94596
4 Telephone: (925) 210-2800
Facsimile: (925) 945-1975
5 Email: cglynn@glynnfinley.com
afriedenberg@glynnfinley.com
6
Attorneys for Defendant and Counter-Plaintiff
7 ConocoPhillips Company
8

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 HOUTAN PETROLEUM, INC.)	Case No. 3:07-cv-5627 SC
)	
12 Plaintiff,)	<u>CONOCOPHILLIPS COMPANY'S</u>
)	<u>REQUEST FOR REASSIGNMENT TO</u>
13 vs.)	<u>NEW UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE</u>
)	<u>JUDGE FOR SETTLEMENT</u>
14 CONOCOPHILLIPS COMPANY, a Texas)	<u>CONFERENCE</u>
corporation and DOES 1 through 10,)	
15 Inclusive)	
)	
16 Defendants.)	
_____)	

18 At the Pretrial Conference on February 6, 2008, the Court ordered the parties to complete
19 a settlement conference before a United States Magistrate Judge. Judge Larson thereafter
20 scheduled the matter for settlement conference on March 12, 2008. (Docket No. 86.)

21 ConocoPhillips is, of course, pleased to proceed before Judge Larson, but understands that Judge
22 Larson is unavailable to conduct a settlement conference prior to March 12, 2008.

23 ConocoPhillips believes it is important that the parties complete the settlement
24 conference as soon as possible for a number of reasons. Most importantly, in light of the
25 vacation of the trial date, Houtan Petroleum remains in possession of ConocoPhillips' equipment
26 and improvements, without paying rent, and in direct defiance of the Court's order denying
27 injunctive relief (Docket No. 18). With every day that passes, Houtan Petroleum continues to
28 help itself to injunctive relief the Court properly denied. As a result, and as this Court has

1 already recognized, the status quo creates considerable environmental risks as ConocoPhillips
2 has no contractual or other right to supervise the subject service station. (*Id.* at 18:24-27 “[i]n
3 light of the environmental issues associated with a gas station, Conoco would be exposed to risks
4 if it were unable to supervise or ensure prudent station practices and compliance with applicable
5 regulations”).

6 Accordingly, ConocoPhillips respectfully requests that the Court consider reassigning the
7 parties to the first available United States Magistrate Judge for a settlement conference at the
8 Court’s earliest convenience. In the event that no United States Magistrate Judge in the District
9 is available prior to March 12, then ConocoPhillips would of course be pleased to proceed as
10 scheduled before Judge Larson.

11 Counsel for ConocoPhillips has conferred with counsel for Plaintiff, Houtan Petroleum,
12 Inc., regarding this request. Plaintiff’s counsel has advised that Plaintiff does not oppose the
13 request for an earlier settlement conference.

14

15 Dated: February 8, 2008

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25


26

27

28

GLYNN & FINLEY, LLP
CLEMENT L. GLYNN
ADAM FRIEDENBERG
One Walnut Creek Center
100 Pringle Avenue, Suite 500
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

By


Attorneys for Defendant and
Counter-Plaintiff ConocoPhillips
Company